

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

HAROLD D. HARDEN,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SOBORO, *et al.*,

Defendants.

2:14-cv-00560-JAD-NJK

ORDER

(Docket No. 80)

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion for "redress as a matter of law considering the exceptional circumstances and outrageous conduct of defendants." *See* Docket No. 80. Defendants filed a response in opposition. Docket No. 84. No reply was filed. The Court finds the motion properly resolved without oral argument. *See* Local Rule 78-2. For the reasons discussed below, the motion is hereby **DENIED**.

Plaintiff asserts that former Deputy Attorney General Kali Fox Miller had entered into an oral settlement agreement with him, but provides no declaration or evidentiary support for that assertion. *See* Docket No. 80 at 1. Moreover, Defendants have provided documentation that the telephone conversation actually related to setting a settlement conference in another case. *See* Docket No. 84 at 2, Docket No. 84-1.¹ Plaintiff also asserts that Defendants are engaged in various types of wrongdoing,

¹ Plaintiff makes much of the fact that the deputy attorney general assigned to this case has changed several times, *see* Docket No. 80 at 2, but the Court discerns no nefarious conduct in Defendants' changes in counsel.

1 such as denying him medical care and making racial slurs. *See* Docket No. 80 at 2. No details are
2 provided with respect to the wrongdoing alleged and, once again, Plaintiff provides no declaration or
3 evidentiary support for the assertion.

4 Having failed to sufficiently support the allegations in his motion, Plaintiff's pending motion is
5 hereby **DENIED**.

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 DATED: May 19, 2015

8
9
10 
11 _____
12 NANCY J. KOPPE
13 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26